

Appl. No. 10/649,335
Rule 312 Amdt. dated May 24, 2006
In Reply to Notice of Allowability of Feb. 24, 2006

REMARKS

In the Notice of Allowability of February 24, 2006, the Examiner amended the record in an Examiner's Amendment.

The listing of claims reflects the Examiner's Amendment to claims 3, 7 and 9 as set forth in the Notice of Allowability of February 24, 2006.

With respect to claim 3 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner amended claim 3 by replacing "a plurality of inter-finger interference cancellation signals" with "*said* plurality of inter-finger interference cancellation signals" (italics added). Applicants respectfully reject the Examiner's Amendment with respect to claim 3. Applicants have amended claim 3 to reflect the original language of "a plurality of inter-finger interference cancellation signals". Claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, does not recite "a plurality of inter-finger interference cancellation signals" (underlining added for emphasis). Instead, claim 1 recites "a plurality of intra-finger interference cancellation signals" (underlining added for emphasis). Accordingly, the insertion of "said" in claim 3 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment is incorrect.

With respect to claim 7 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment, Applicants agree with the Examiner's Amendment in that "of" was inadvertently omitted. Claim 7 reflects the fact that it was previously presented because claim 7 was previously amended by the Examiner's Amendment.

With respect to claim 9 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner amended claim 9 by replacing "synthesizing N inter-finger interference cancellation signals" with "synthesizing *said* N inter-finger interference cancellation signals" (italics added). Applicants respectfully reject the Examiner's Amendment with respect to claim 9. Applicants have amended claim 9 to reflect the original language of "synthesizing N inter-finger interference cancellation signals". Claim 9 does not previously recite "N inter-finger interference cancellation signals" (underlining added for emphasis). Instead, claim 9 previously recites "N intra-finger interference cancellation signals" (underlining added for emphasis). Accordingly,


Appl. No. 10/649,335
Rule 312 Amdt. dated May 24, 2006
In Reply to Notice of Allowability of Feb. 24, 2006

the insertion of "said" in claim 9 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment is incorrect.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Date: May 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


Michael T. Cruz
Reg. No. 44,636

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, Suite 3400
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8084
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100